

Graphical Log-linear Models: Fundamental Concepts and Applications

Niharika Gauraha
Indian Statistical Institute

March 15, 2016

Abstract: We present a comprehensive study of graphical log-linear models for contingency tables. High dimensional contingency tables arise in many areas such as computational biology, collection of survey and census data and others. Analysis of contingency tables involving several factors or categorical variables is very hard. To determine interactions among various factors, graphical and decomposable log-linear models are preferred. First, we explore connections between the conditional independence in probability and graphs; thereafter we provide a few illustrations to describe how graphical log-linear model are useful to interpret the conditional independences between factors. We also discuss the problem of estimation and model selection in decomposable models.

Keywords: Graphical Log-linear Models, Contingency Tables, Decomposable Models, Hierarchical Log-linear Models

1 Introduction

In this paper, our aim is to provide the reader with insight into the graphical log-linear models by providing a concise explanation of the underlying mathematics and statistics, by pointing out relationships to conditional independence in probability and graphs and providing pointers to available software and important references.

Log Linear Models(abbreviated as LLMs) are the most widely used models for analyzing cross-classified categorical data, see [9]. Though LLM supports various range of models based on non-interaction assumptions. But for fairly large dimensional tables the analysis becomes difficult, as the number of factors increases the number of interaction terms grows exponentially. Graphical Log Linear Models(abbreviated as GLLMs) are a way of representing relationships among the factors of a contingency table using a graph. GLLMs have two great advantages: from the graph structure it is easy to

read off the conditional independence relations and graph based algorithms usually provide efficient computational algorithms for parameter estimation and model selection.

The decomposable log linear models are a restricted class of GLLMs which are based on chordal graphs. There are several reasons for using decomposable models over an ordinary GLLM. Firstly, the maximum likelihood estimates can be found explicitly. Secondly, closed form expressions exists for test statistics. Another advantage is that it has triangulated graph based, efficient inference algorithms. Thus decomposable models are mostly used for analysis of high dimensional tables.

We have organized the rest of the article in the following manner. In section 2, we briefly review graph theory, conditional independence in probability and Markov Networks. Section 3 gives overview of contingency tables and describes different types of contingency tables based on the underlying sampling distributions. Section 4 introduces the theory of log-linear interaction models and defines various classes of LLMs such as comprehensive, hierarchical, graphical and decomposable LLMs. Section 5 is concerned with statistical properties of LLMs such as the sufficient statistics, the Maximum Likelihood Estimates(MLE) and model testing. In section 6, we discuss the analysis of three-factor contingency tables. In section 7, the backward model selection algorithm for decomposable models is illustrated with an example. Section 8 gives computational details. We shall provide some concluding remarks in section 9.

2 Graph Theory and Markov Networks

In this section, we briefly review the graph theoretic concepts, the conditional independence in probability and Markov Networks.

2.1 Graph Theory

Here we list and define the necessary concepts of graph theory that we will be using in later sections. See [49], for further details on graph theory.

A graph G , is a pair $G = (V, E)$, where V is a set of vertices and E is a set of edges. A graph is said to be an undirected graph when E is a set of unordered pairs of vertices. We consider only simple graph that has neither loops nor multiple edges.

Definition 1 (Boundary) *Let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph. The neighbours or boundary of a subset A of vertices is a subset C of vertices such that all nodes in C are not in A but are adjacent to some vertex in A .*

$$bd(A) = \{u \in V \setminus A \mid \exists v \in A : \{u, v\} \in E\}$$

Definition 2 (Maximal Clique) A clique of a graph G is a subset C of vertices such that all vertices in C are mutually adjacent. A clique is said to be maximal if no vertex can be added to C without violating clique property.

Definition 3 (Chordal(Triangulated) Graphs) In graph theory, a chord of a cycle C is defined as the edge which is not in the edge set of C but joins two vertices from the vertex set C . A graph is said to be chordal graph if every cycle of four or more length has a chord.

Definition 4 (Isomorphic Graphs) Two graphs are said to be isomorphic if they have same number of vertices, same number of edges and they are connected in the same way.

2.2 Conditional Independence

The concept of conditional independence in probability theory is very important and it is the basis for the graphical models. It is defined as follows.

Definition 5 (Conditional Independence) Let X, Y and Z be random variables with a joint distribution P . The random variables X and Y are said to be conditionally independent given the random variable Z if and only if the following holds.

$$\begin{aligned} P(X, Y \mid Z) &= P(X \mid Z)P(Y \mid Z) \\ P(X \mid Y, Z) &= P(X \mid Z) \end{aligned}$$

We sometimes also use David's notation (see [15] for details), $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y \mid Z$.

Conditional independence has a vast literature in the field of probability and statistics, we refer to [15] and [43] for further details.

2.3 Markov Networks and Markov Properties

In this section, we define Markov network graphs, Markov networks and different Markov properties for the Markov Networks.

Definition 6 (Markov Network Graphs) A Markov network graph is an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$, where $V = \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n\}$ represents random variables of a multivariate distribution.

Definition 7 (Markov Networks) A Markov network M , is a pair $M = (G, \psi)$. Where G is a Markov network graph and $\psi = \{\psi_1, \psi_2, \dots, \psi_m\}$ is a set of non negative functions for each maximal clique $C_i \in G \forall i = 1 \dots m$ and the joint pdf can be decomposed into factors as

$$P(x) = \frac{1}{Z} \prod_{a \in C_m} \psi_a(x)$$

where Z is a normalizing constant.

Definition 8 ((P) Pairwise Markov Property) A probability distribution P satisfies the pairwise Markov property for a given undirected graph G if, for every pair of non adjacent edges X and Y , X is independent of Y given the rest.

$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y \mid (V \setminus X, Y)$$

Definition 9 ((L) Local Markov Property) A probability distribution P satisfies the local Markov property for a given undirected graph G if, every variable X is conditionally independent of its non neighbours in the graph, given its neighbours.

$$X \perp\!\!\!\perp (V \setminus X \cup \text{bd}(X)) \mid \text{bd}(X)$$

where $\text{bd}(X)$ denotes boundary of X .

Definition 10 ((G) Global Markov Property) A probability distribution P , is said to be global Markov with respect to an undirected graph G if, for any disjoint subsets of nodes A, B, C such that C separates A and B on the graph, if and only if the distribution satisfies

$$A \perp\!\!\!\perp B \mid C$$

We must note that the above three Markov properties are not equivalent to each other. The Local Markov property is stronger than the pairwise one, while weaker than the global one. More precisely, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 11 For any probability measure the following holds.

$$(G) \implies (L) \implies (P)$$

See [39] for the proof of the proposition (11). We refer to [50], [39] and [17] for more details on graphical models and to [13] and [12] for Markov fields for LLMs.

Notations and Assumptions

In this section, we discuss the notations and the assumptions which we will be using throughout the remaining sections of this article. We mainly consider the three-dimensional tables for notational simplification, which is also a true representative of k -dimensions and thus can be easily extended to any higher dimensions by increasing the number of subscripts. We mostly

follow the notation from [9] and [8], for additional details we refer to these books.

Let us consider a three dimensional table with factors X, Y and Z. It must be noted that we interchangeably use numeric{1, 2, 3} and alphabetic{X, Y, Z} symbols for representing the factors of a contingency table. Suppose the factors X, Y and Z have I, J and K levels respectively, then we have an $I \times J \times K$ contingency table.

The following notations are defined for each elementary cell $(i, j, k) \quad \forall i = 1 \dots I, \forall j = 1 \dots J, \forall k = 1 \dots K$

- n_{ijk} = the observed counts in the cell (i, j, k)
- m_{ijk} = the expected counts in the cell (i, j, k)
- $\hat{m}_{ijk}$ = The Maximum Likelihood Estimate of m_{ijk}
- p_{ijk} = probability of a count falling in cell (i, j, k)
- $\hat{p}_{ijk}$ = The Maximum Likelihood Estimate of $p_{i,j,k}$

The following notations are used for sums of elementary cell counts. where “.” represents summation over that factor. For example

$$n_{i..} = \sum_{jk} n_{ijk} = \sum_k n_{i.k}$$

$$N = n_{...} = \text{total number of observations}$$

Similarly the marginal totals of probabilities and the expected counts are denoted by $p_{.jk}$, and $m_{.jk}$ etc.

We represent “C” as tables of sums obtained by summing over one or more factors, i.e. C_{12} represents tables of counts $\{n_{ij.}\}$. Subscripted u-terms notation are used for main effects and interactions. For example $u_{12(ij)}$ is used for two-factor interactions $\forall i = 1 \dots I, \forall j = 1 \dots J$. We may interchangeably use $u_{12(ij)}$ and u_{12} , later one is obtained by simply dropping the second set of subscript. Thus $u_{12} = u_{12(ij)} \forall i = 1 \dots I, \forall j = 1 \dots J$.

We assume that the observed cell counts are strictly positive for all models we consider throughout this article.

3 Overview of Contingency Tables

In this section, we briefly review structural representation for count data called contingency tables. A contingency table is a table of counts that summarizes relationship between factors. In a multivariate qualitative data where each individual is described by a set of attributes, all individual with same attributes are counted and this count is entered into cell of a corresponding contingency table, see [8]. The term “contingency” was introduced by [44]. There is an extensive literature on contingency tables, see [3], [5] and [24].

Example 12 (Example of a three-dimensional contingency table) *example 3.2.1 of [9].*

Table 1: Personality Type Table

Personality Type	Cholestrol	Diastolic Blood Pressure	
		Normal	High
A	Normal	716	79
	High	207	25
B	Normal	819	67
	High	186	22

3.1 Types of Contingency Tables

Based on the underlying assumption of sampling distributions, contingency tables are divided into three main categories as follows.

3.1.1 The Poisson Model

In this model, it is assumed that cell counts are independent and Poisson-distributed. The total number of counts and the marginal counts are random variables. For three-dimensional tables with counts as random variables as n_{ijk} , the joint probability density function(pdf) can be written as

$$\prod_{ijk} \frac{m_{ijk}^{n_{ijk}} e^{-m_{ijk}}}{n_{ijk}!} \quad (1)$$

3.1.2 The Multinomial Model

In this model, it is assumed that total number of subjects, N , are fixed. With this constraint imposed on independent Poisson distributions, the cell counts yield a multinomial distribution. For proof we refer to [21].

The pdf for this model is given as

$$\frac{N!}{\prod_{ijk} n_{ijk}!} \prod_{ijk} \left(\frac{m_{ijk}}{N} \right)^{n_{ijk}} \quad (2)$$

3.1.3 The Product Multinomial Model

In this model, it is assumed that one set of marginal count is fixed and The corresponding table of sums follow a product-multinomial distribution. For

example, consider a three-dimensional table with total counts for factor 1, $n_{.jk}$, fixed. The pdf is given as

$$\prod_{jk} \left[\frac{n_{.jk}!}{\prod_i n_{ijk}!} \prod_i \left(\frac{m_{ijk}}{n_{.jk}} \right)^{n_{ijk}} \right] \quad (3)$$

4 Introduction to Log-linear Models

This section introduces log-linear models for contingency tables. As discussed previously, the distribution of cell probabilities belong to exponential family (Poisson, multinomial and product-multinomial). Here we construct a linear model in the log scale of the expected cell count.

A log-linear model for three-factor table is define as

$$\ln m_{ijk} = u + u_{1(i)} + u_{2(j)} + u_{3(k)} + u_{12(ij)} + u_{13(ik)} + u_{23(jk)} + u_{123(ijk)} \quad (4)$$

with the following identifiability constraints:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i u_{1(i)} &= \sum_j u_{2(j)} = \sum_k u_{3(k)} = 0 \\ \sum_i u_{12(ij)} &= \sum_j u_{12(ij)} = 0 \\ \sum_i u_{13(ik)} &= \sum_k u_{13(ik)} = 0 \\ \sum_j u_{23(jk)} &= \sum_k u_{23(jk)} = 0 \\ \sum_i u_{123(ijk)} &= \sum_j u_{123(ijk)} = \sum_k u_{123(ijk)} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

The above model is called *saturated* or *unrestricted* because it contains all possible one-way, two-way and three-way effects. In general if no interaction terms are set to zero, it is called the saturated model.

We must note that the number of terms in a log-linear model depends on the dimensions or number of factors and the interdependencies between the factors, it does not depend on the number of cells, see [6] for more details.

The model given by the equation(4) applies to the all three kinds of contingency tables with three factors(as discussed in previous section) but there may be differences in the interpretations of the interaction terms, see [34] and [37]. There is a wide literature on LLMs, see for instance, [1], [9], [51], [8] and [31].

4.1 Log-Linear Models as Generalized Linear Models

Let us recall the generalized linear model (GLM). It consists of a linear predictor and a link function. Link function determines relationship between the mean and the linear predictor. Here we show that the LLMs are special instances of GLMs for Poisson-distributed data, see [42] for the details.

Consider a 2×2 Poisson model with two factors say X and Y, suppose cell counts n_{ij} are response variables such that $n_{ij} \sim \text{Poisson}(m_{ij})$ and the factors X and Y are explanatory variables.

define a link function g as

$$g(m_{ij}) = \ln m_{ij}$$

the linear predictor is defined as $X'\beta$

where X is the design matrix and β is the vector of unknown parameters.

For this model, X and β are defined as

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \beta = \begin{pmatrix} \mu \\ \alpha_1 \\ \alpha_2 \\ \beta_1 \\ \beta_2 \\ (\alpha\beta)_{11} \\ (\alpha\beta)_{12} \\ (\alpha\beta)_{21} \\ (\alpha\beta)_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

The model can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \ln m_{ij} &= x_i' \beta \\ &= \mu + \alpha_i + \beta_j + (\alpha\beta)_{ij} \end{aligned}$$

We rename the parameters as

$$\ln m_{ij} = u + u_{1(i)} + u_{2(j)} + u_{12(ij)}$$

We notice that the above model is the same as the LLM defined for two-factor tables, where u is the overall mean, u_1, u_2 are the main effects and u_{12} is the interaction effect.

We note that we can fit LLMs as generalized linear models by using software packages available for generalized linear models, for example `glm()` function in “stats” R package.

4.2 Classes of Log Linear Models

In this section, we discuss various classes of LLMs.

4.2.1 Comprehensive Log-linear models

The class of comprehensive Log-linear models is defined as follows.

Definition 13 (Comprehensive Log-linear Model) *A log-linear model is said to be comprehensive if it contains the main effects of all the factors.*

For example, A Comprehensive LLM for the three-factor contingency tables must include all the main effects u_1 , u_2 and u_3 along with other interaction effects if any, see [51] for the details.

4.2.2 Hierarchical Log-linear models

The class of hierarchical log-linear models is defined as follows.

Definition 14 (Hierarchical Log-linear Models) *A LLM is said to be hierarchical if it contains all the lower-order terms which can be derived from the variables contained in a higher-order term.*

For example, if a model for three-dimension table includes u_{12} then u_1 and u_2 must be present or conversely if $u_2 = 0$ then we must have $u_{12} = u_{123} = 0$.

It can be noted that hierarchical models may be represented by giving only the terms of highest order, also known as generating class, since all the lower-order terms are implicit. Generating class is defined as follows.

Definition 15 (Generating class) *The highest order terms in hierarchical Log-linear models are called generating class because they generate all of the lower order terms in the model.*

Example 16 *A log linear model with generating class $C = \{[123], [34]\}$ corresponds to the following log-linear model.*

$$\ln m_{hijk} = u + u_{1(h)} + u_{2(i)} + u_{3(j)} + u_{4(k)} + u_{12(hi)} + u_{23(ij)} + u_{13(hj)} + u_{123(hij)} + u_{34(jk)}$$

members of generating class $[123] = \{[1], [2], [3], [12], [23], [13], [123]\}$

members of generating class $[34] = \{[3], [4], [34]\}$

All models considered in the remaining sections of this article are hierarchical and comprehensive LLMs unless stated otherwise.

4.2.3 Graphical Log-linear Models

In this section, we consider a class of LLMs that can be represented by graphs, called graphical log-linear models (GLLMs).

Definition 17 (Graphical Log-linear Models (GLLMs)) *A LLM model is said to be graphical if it contains all the lower order terms which can be derived from variables contained in a higher-order term, the model also contains the higher order interaction.*

For example, if a model includes u_{12}, u_{23} and u_{31} it also contains the term u_{123} .

In GLLMs, the vertices correspond to the factors and the edges correspond to the two-factor interactions. But the factors(vertices) and the two-factor interactions(edges) alone do not specify the graphical models. As mentioned previously, factorization of the probability distribution with respect to a graph must satisfy the Markov properties. For such a graph that respects Markov property with respect to a probability distribution, there is one-to-one correspondence between GLLMs and graphs. It follows that every GLLM determines a graph and every graph determines a GLLM, it is illustrated by the following examples.

Example 18 *Let us consider the model $[123][134]$. The two factor terms generated by $[123]$ are $[12][13][23]$, similarly two factor terms generated by $[134]$ are $[13][14][34]$. The corresponding graph is as given in the figure (1):*




Figure 1: Graphical Model $[123],[134]$

Conversely we can also read log-linear model directly from the corresponding graph.




Figure 2: Graphical Model $[123] [34]$

Consider a graph given in the figure(2), the edges are $[12]$, $[23]$, $[13]$ and

[34]. Since the generating class for the terms [12], [23] and [13] is the term [123], we must include [123] in the model. Hence the corresponding GLLM is [123][34].

We must note that, generating classes of graphical log-linear models are in a one-to-one correspondence with the maximal cliques of corresponding graph. Let us also note that not all hierarchical log-linear models have graphical representation. For example the model [12][13][23] is hierarchical but it is not graphical since it does not contain the higher order term [123].

4.2.4 Decomposable Models

In this section, we define the class of decomposable models which is a subclass of GLLMs.

Definition 19 (Decomposable log-linear Models) *A LLM model is decomposable if it is both graphical and chordal.*

The main advantage of this model over other models is that it has closed form Maximum Likelihood Estimates(abbreviated as MLE, which is explained in the later sections).

For example, let us consider a decomposable model given by the figure (1). The only conditional independence implied by the graph is that, given the factors 1 and 3, factors 2 and 4 are independent. The maximum likelihood estimates for the expected cell counts are factorized in a closed form in the terms of sufficient statistics as


$$\hat{m}_{hijk} = n_{hij}.n_{h.jk}/n_{h.j}.$$

The derivation of the above such expressions are discussed in the details in section 5.

The table (2) shows all the possible non-isomorphic graphical and decomposable models for the four-factor contingency tables.

Few important articles concerned with the decomposable models are [[26], [27], [29], [29], [40],[41], [10]].

Table 2: Graphical Log-linear Models for four-way tables

Model	Graph	Closed-form Estimates
[1][2][3][4]		$\hat{m}_{hijk} = \frac{n_{h...}n_{...i...}n_{...j...}n_{...k}}{n^3_{...}}$






$$[12][3][4] \quad \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \bullet \\ \diagdown \\ 2 \\ \bullet \\ 4 \end{array} \quad \hat{m}_{hijk} = \frac{n_{hi..}n_{.ij.}n_{...k}}{n_{...}^2}$$

$$[12][13][4] \quad \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ 3 \\ 1 \\ \bullet \\ \diagdown \\ 2 \\ \bullet \\ 4 \end{array} \quad \hat{m}_{hijk} = \frac{n_{hi..}n_{h.j.}n_{...k}}{n_{h...}n_{....}}$$

$$[12][34] \quad \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \bullet \\ \diagdown \\ 2 \\ \bullet \\ 3 \\ \diagdown \\ 4 \end{array} \quad \hat{m}_{hijk} = \frac{n_{hi..}n_{.jk}}{n_{...}}$$

$$[12][13][14] \quad \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \bullet \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ 4 \quad 2 \\ \bullet \\ 3 \end{array} \quad \hat{m}_{hijk} = \frac{n_{hi..}n_{h.j.}n_{h..k}}{n_{h...}^2}$$

$$[12][23][34] \quad \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \bullet \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ 2 \quad 4 \\ \bullet \\ 3 \end{array} \quad \hat{m}_{hijk} = \frac{n_{hi..}n_{.ij.}n_{...jk}}{n_{.i.}n_{.j.}}$$

$[123][4]$		$\hat{m}_{hijk} = \frac{n_{hij} n_{...k}}{n_{...}}$
$[123][14]$		$\hat{m}_{hijk} = \frac{n_{hij} n_{h..k}}{n_{h...}}$
$[12][23][34][14]$		No closed-form estimates exist
$[123][134]$		$\hat{m}_{hijk} = \frac{n_{hij} n_{h..jk}}{n_{h..j.}}$
$[1234]$		$\hat{m}_{hijk} = n_{hijk}$

5 Statistical Properties of the Log-linear Models

In this section, we discuss statistical properties of the hierarchical LLMs, like the existence of sufficient statistics, uniqueness of the MLE and model testing. First, we derive sufficient statistics for the unknown parameters of the model. Then we show how to compute the MLE of the expected cell counts from the sufficient statistics without computing the model parameters. We also show that for some models the estimated cell counts are the explicit closed function of the sufficient statistics, whereas for others we need iterative procedures.

5.1 The Sufficient Statistics for LLMs

We show that the sufficient statistics exist for the hierarchical LLMs and they are very easy to obtain. Let us consider the saturated model with simple multinomial sampling distribution for the 3-factor contingency tables. The log-likelihood function of the multinomial is obtained from the pdf given by the equation (1) as follows.

$$\ln f(\{n_{ijk}\}) = \ln \left(\frac{N!}{\prod_{ijk} n_{ijk}!} \right) + \sum_{ijk} n_{ijk} \ln(m_{ijk}) - N \ln N \quad (5)$$

Or equivalently we can write the above expression as

$$\ln f(\{n_{ijk}\}) = \sum_{ijk} n_{ijk} \ln(m_{ijk}) + C \quad (6)$$

Where “ C ” represents the constant terms. Substituting the value for $\ln(m_{ijk})$ as given by the equation (4) we get the following expression.

$$\ln f(\{n_{ijk}\}) = \sum_{ijk} n_{ijk} (u + u_1 + u_2 + u_3 + u_{12} + u_{13} + u_{23} + u_{123}) + C$$

the above expression can be also written as

$$\begin{aligned} f(\{n_{ijk}\}) = \exp & \left(Nu + \sum_i u_1 n_{i..} + \sum_i u_1 n_{i..} + \sum_j u_2 n_{.j.} + \sum_k u_3 n_{...k} + \right. \\ & \left. \sum_{ij} u_{12} n_{ij.} + \sum_{ik} u_{13} n_{i.k} + \sum_{jk} u_{23} n_{.jk} + \sum_{ijk} u_{123} n_{ijk} + C \right) \end{aligned}$$

Since multinomial distribution belongs to exponential family sufficient statistic exists, see [4]. From the above expression it is apparent that for the three-factor saturated model, the full table itself is the sufficient statistic since the lower order terms are redundant and it will be subsumed in the full table.

We note that the marginal sub-tables which correspond to the set of generating classes are the sufficient statistics for the log-linear models, see [6].

Example 20 Consider a four-factors table with the following generating classes.

$$\{C_1, C_2\} = \{[123], [34]\}$$

then $C_1(n) = [n_{ijk.}]$, it is a three-dimensional marginal sub table.
and $C_2(n) = [n_{..kl}]$, it is a two-dimensional marginal sub table.

These two marginal sub-tables are the sufficient for this model.

For more details and the proofs on the sufficient statistics for hierarchical LLMs see [6] and [28].

5.2 The Maximum Likelihood Estimates for LLMs

First, we state that a unique set of MLE for every cell count can be obtained from the sufficient statistics alone, see [6] for the proof.

Now we state the Birch criteria as follows:

1. The marginal sub-tables obtained by summing over the factors not present in the max-cliques are the sufficient statistics for the corresponding expected cell counts. i.e., for the model $\{[123], [34]\}$, $C_1(n) = ((n_{ijk.}))$ and $C_2(n) = ((n_{..jk}))$ are sufficient statistics for $m_{ijk.}$ and $m_{..jk}$ respectively.
2. All the sufficient statistics must be the same as the corresponding marginal sub-tables of their estimate means.

$$C_i(\hat{m}) = C_i(n) \quad \forall i = 1 \text{ to } \# \text{ of generating classes}$$

i.e., for the model $\{[123], [34]\}$ the estimated cell counts are

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{m}_{ijk.} &= n_{ijk.} \\ \hat{m}_{..kl} &= n_{..kl} \end{aligned}$$

Finally, the MLE of the expected cell counts for the model $\{[123], [34]\}$ is expressed as follows.

$$\hat{m}_{hijk} = \frac{n_{hij.} n_{..jk}}{n_{..j.}}$$

In section 5.4, we derive the closed form expressions for the MLEs in terms of sufficient statistics for three-factor contingency tables.

The reason for choosing MLE for computing the expected cell counts is its consistency and efficiency in the large samples. There is extensive research on the MLE of LLMs, we refer few of them here [23], [3], [29], [41], [6], [20], [36], [38] and [11] .

5.3 Testing models

The assessment of a model fit is very important as it describes how well it fits the data. We use the following test statistics.

- Pearson's χ^2 Statistic: which is defined as

$$\chi^2 = \sum_i \frac{(O_i - E_i)^2}{E_i}$$

where O denotes the observed cell counts and E as the expected cell counts.

- Deviance goodness of fit test statistics: We test a model against the saturated model using the deviance goodness of fit test, which is defined as follows.

$$G^2 = -2 \sum_i O_i \log \frac{E_i}{O_i}$$

Under null hypotheses deviance is also distributes as χ^2 with the appropriate degrees of freedom.

Table (3), lists the degree of freedom of all the possible models for three-factor tables. For more information about the model testing we refer [14], [33] and [35].

Table 3: Degrees of freedom

Model	df
[1][2][3]	IJK - I - J - K + 2
[12][3]	(IJ-1)(K-1)
[13][2]	(IK-1)(J-1)
[23][1]	(JK-1)(I-1)
[12][13]	I(J-1)(K-1)
[12][23]	J(I-1)(K-1)
[13][23]	K(I-1)(J-1)
[12][13][23]	(I-1)(J-1)(K-1)
[123]	0

6 The Analysis of three-factor Contingency Tables

In this section, we discuss the different interaction models for three-factor tables. We also derive mathematical formulation for the MLE of the expected counts(when it is possible) for each model.

6.1 The Complete Independence Model

This is the simplest model where all the factors are mutually independent and $u_{12} = u_{13} = u_{23} = u_{123} = 0$. The following different equivalent notations can be used to represent this model.

$$\begin{aligned} X &\perp\!\!\!\perp Y \perp\!\!\!\perp Z \\ \ln(m_{ijk}) &= u + u_1 + u_2 + u_3 \\ C &= \{[1], [2], [3]\} \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

This model can be represented graphically as given in the figure (3).




Figure 3: The Complete Independence Model

Example 21 When we substitute the value of $\ln(m_{ijk})$ as given in the equation (4) to log-likelihood kernel as given by the equation (6) and ignoring the constant term we get

$$\begin{aligned} f(\{n_{ijk}\}) &= \sum_{ijk} n_{ijk} \ln(m_{ijk}) \\ &= \sum_{ijk} n_{ijk} (u + u_1 + u_2 + u_3 +) \end{aligned}$$

after simplification we obtain

$$f(\{n_{ijk}\}) = \exp(Nu + \sum_i u_1 n_{i..} + \sum_j u_2 n_{.j.} + \sum_k u_3 n_{..k})$$

From the above expression we obtain the sufficient statistics for this models as marginal sub-tables: $C_1 = \{n_{i..}\}$, $C_2 = \{n_{.j.}\}$ and $C_3 = \{n_{..k}\}$ which are estimates of $m_{i..}$, $m_{.j.}$ and $m_{..k}$ respectively.

From the equation (7), by summing over jk, ik, ij and ijk we obtain $m_{i..}$,

$m_{.j}$ and $m_{.k}$ and $m_{...}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} m_{i..} &= \exp(u + u_1) \sum_{jk} \exp(u_2 + u_3) \\ &= \exp(u + u_1) \sum_j \exp(u_2) \sum_k \exp(u_3) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} m_{.j.} &= \exp(u + u_2) \sum_{ik} \exp(u_1 + u_3) \\ &= \exp(u + u_2) \sum_i \exp(u_1) \sum_k \exp(u_3) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} m_{..k} &= \exp(u + u_3) \sum_{ij} \exp(u_1 + u_2) \\ &= \exp(u + u_3) \sum_i \exp(u_1) \sum_j \exp(u_2) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} m_{...} &= \exp(u) \sum_{ijk} \exp(u_1 + u_2 + u_3) \\ &= \exp(u) \sum_i \exp(u_1) \sum_j \exp(u_2) \sum_k \exp(u_3) \end{aligned}$$

From the above equations we get the expression for m_{ijk} as

$$m_{ijk} = \frac{m_{i..} m_{.j.} m_{..k}}{m_{...}^2}$$

Applying Birch's result we get the estimates of m_{ijk} as

$$\hat{m}_{ijk} = \frac{n_{i..} n_{.j.} n_{..k}}{n_{...}^2}$$

Let us consider a contingency table as in table (1), Under the complete independence assumption the sufficient statistics are the following marginal sub-tables.

Table 4: Personality Type

<u>Personality Type</u>	
A	1027
B	1094

Table 5: Cholestrol

<u>Cholestrol</u>	
Normal	1681
High	440

Table 6: DBP

<u>Cholestrol</u>	
Normal	1005
High	1116

Under the complete independence assumption the table of fitted values are

Table 7: Table of Estimated Cell Counts

<i>Personality Type</i>	<i>Cholestrol</i>	<i>Diastolic Blood Pressure</i>	
		<i>Normal</i>	<i>High</i>
<i>A</i>	<i>Normal</i>	739.9	74.07
	<i>High</i>	193.7	19.39
<i>B</i>	<i>Normal</i>	788.2	78.9
	<i>High</i>	206.3	20.65

The G^2 statistic for the model is 8.723(df:4, p-value:0.068), hence we conclude that the data supports the complete independence model. For details on Chi-Squared test of Independence we refer the reader to [27].

6.2 The Joint Independence Model

Under this model two factors are jointly independent of the third factor. There are three versions of this model, depending on which factor is unrelated to the other two. These three models are $(X, Y) \perp\!\!\!\perp Z$, $(X, Z) \perp\!\!\!\perp Y$ and $(Y, Z) \perp\!\!\!\perp X$. We consider only $(X, Y) \perp\!\!\!\perp Z$ in detail as others are comparable.

Equivalent different notations are as

$$\begin{aligned}
 &(X, Y) \perp\!\!\!\perp Z \\
 &\ln(m_{ijk}) = u + u_1 + u_2 + u_3 + u_{12} \\
 &C = \{[12], [3]\}
 \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

This model can also be represented graphically as given in the figure (4). The




Figure 4: The Joint Independence Model

sufficient statistics for this models are the marginal sub-tables: $C_1 = \{n_{ij.}\}$ and $C_2 = \{n_{..j}\}$ which are the estimates of $m_{ij.}$ and $m_{..k}$. From the equation

(8) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
m_{ij.} &= \exp(u + u_1 + u_2 + u_{12}) \sum_k \exp(u_3) \\
m_{..k} &= \exp(u + u_3) \sum_{ij} \exp(u_1 + u_2 + u_{12}) \\
m_{...} &= \exp(u) \sum_{ij} \exp(u_1 + u_2 + u_{12}) \sum_k \exp(u_3)
\end{aligned}$$

From the above equations we derive the closed form expression for m_{ijk} as

$$m_{ijk} = \frac{m_{ij.} m_{..k}}{m_{...}}$$

Applying Birch's criteria we get

$$\hat{m}_{ijk} = \frac{n_{ij.} n_{..k}}{n_{...}}$$

We note that if the previous model of the complete independence ($X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y \perp\!\!\!\perp Z$) fits a data set, then the model $((XY) \perp\!\!\!\perp Z)$ will also fit. But the smallest model will be preferred.

Example 22 *Let us consider another example to discuss this model.*

Table 8: Classroom Behaviour Table (Everitt,1977)

		<i>Risk</i>	
<i>Classroom Behaviour</i>	<i>Adversity of School</i>	<i>Not at risk</i>	<i>at Risk</i>
<i>Nondeviant</i>	<i>Low</i>	16	7
	<i>Medium</i>	15	34
	<i>High</i>	5	3
<i>Deviant</i>	<i>Low</i>	1	1
	<i>Medium</i>	3	8
	<i>High</i>	1	3

The sufficient statistics are

Table 9: Adv*risk

<i>Adversity</i>	<i>Risk</i>	
	<i>Not at risk</i>	<i>at Risk</i>
<i>Low</i>	17	8
<i>Medium</i>	18	42
<i>High</i>	6	6

Table 10: Classroom Beha.

<i>Classroom Beha.</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>Nondeviant</i>	80
<i>Deviant</i>	17

Under assumption of this model, the table of the expected cell counts is give in the table (11).

Table 11: Table of Estimated Cell Counts

		<i>Risk</i>	
<i>Classroom Behaviour</i>	<i>Adversity of School</i>	<i>Not at risk</i>	<i>at Risk</i>
<i>Nondeviant</i>	<i>Low</i>	14.020	6.597
	<i>Medium</i>	14.845	34.639
	<i>High</i>	4.948	4.948
<i>Deviant</i>	<i>Low</i>	2.979	1.402
	<i>Medium</i>	3.154	7.360
	<i>High</i>	1.051	1.051

The G^2 statistic for this model is 5.560(df:5, p-value:0.351), hence we conclude that the data supports the joint independence model.

6.3 The Conditional Independence Model

Under this model two factor are conditionally independent given the third factor. There are three version for this model as well, these are $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y|Z$, $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Z|Y$ and $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp Z|X$. We consider only $X \perp\!\!\!\perp Y|Z$ in the detail as derivation for others are similar.

This model can be equivalently represented as

$$\begin{aligned} \ln(m_{ijk}) &= u + u_1 + u_1 + u_3 + u_{13} + u_{23} \\ C &= \{[13][23]\} \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

The graph for this model is given in the figure(5). The sufficient statistics for this model are the marginal sub-tables: $C_{13} = \{n_{i.k}\}$ and $C_{23} = \{n_{.jk}\}$




Figure 5: The Conditional Independence Model

which are estimates of $m_{i.k}$ and $m_{.jk}$. From the equation (9) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 m_{i.k} &= \exp(u + u_1 + u_3 + u_{13}) \sum_j \exp(u_2 + u_{23}) \\
 m_{.jk} &= \exp(u + u_2 + u_3 + u_{23}) \sum_i \exp(u_1 + u_{13}) \\
 m_{..k} &= \exp(u + u_3) \sum_i \exp(u_1 + u_{13}) \sum_j \exp(u_2 + u_{23})
 \end{aligned}$$

From the above three equations we obtain the closed form expression for m_{ijk}

$$m_{ijk} = \frac{m_{ij.} m_{.jk}}{m_{..k}}$$

As before applying Birch's criteria we derive the expected counts for each cell as

$$\hat{m}_{ijk} = \frac{n_{ij.} n_{.jk}}{n_{..k}}$$

Example 23 *Let us consider the following infant's survival table, data taken from [7].*

Table 12: Infant Survival Table

Clinic	Pre-natal care	Infant's Survival	
		Died	Survived
A	Less	3	176
	More	4	293
B	Less	17	197
	More	2	23

Assuming pre-natal care and survival is independent given clinic. The sufficient statistics are

Table 13: survival*clinic

<i>Infant's Survival</i>		
<i>Clinic</i>	<i>died</i>	<i>Survived</i>
<i>A</i>	7	469
<i>B</i>	19	220

Table 14: clinic*prenatalcare

<i>Prenatal Care</i>		
<i>Clinic</i>	<i>Less</i>	<i>More</i>
<i>A</i>	179	297
<i>B</i>	214	25

Table 15: clinic

<i>Clinic</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>A</i>	476
<i>B</i>	239

Table 16: Table of Estimated Cell Counts

		<i>Infant's Survival</i>	
<i>Clinic</i>	<i>Pre-natal care</i>	<i>Died</i>	<i>Survived</i>
<i>A</i>	<i>Less</i>	2.632	176.367
	<i>More</i>	4.367	292.632
<i>B</i>	<i>Less</i>	17.012	196.987
	<i>More</i>	1.987	23.012

The G^2 statistic for this model is 0.082(df:2, p-value:0.959), hence we conclude that the data supports the conditional independence model.

6.4 The Uniform Association Model

This model is also known as no three-factor interaction model, where $u_{123} = 0$. For this model the log-linear notation is ([12], [13], [23]) but there is no graphical representation for this model. Unlike the previous models, there are no closed-form estimates for the expected cell counts/probabilities under this model. The maximum likelihood estimates can be computed by iterative procedures such as iterative proportional fitting(IPF) and Newton Raphson method.

Example 24 Let us consider the following table taken from [18].

Table 17: Auto Accident Table

Accident Type	Driver Ejected	Injury	
		Not Sever	Severe
Collision	No	350	150
	Yes	26	23
RollOver	No	60	112
	Yes	19	80

None of the models discussed in previous sections fit the data. We use iterative proportional fitting algorithm to obtain the table of estimated counts as given in the table (18).

Table 18: Table of Estimated Cell Counts

Accident Type	Driver Ejected	Injury	
		Not Sever	Severe
Collision	No	350.48858	149.51130
	Yes	25.51142	23.48870
RollOver	No	59.51104	112.48921
	Yes	19.48896	79.51079

The G^2 statistic for this model is 0.043(df:1, p-value:0.835), hence we conclude that the data supports the marginal association model.

For more information on IPF we refer to [16] and [19]. We used the IPF procedure implemented in the R package “cat”, available at cran.r-project.org.

6.5 The Saturated Model

For this model the log-linear notation is ([123]). In this case there is no independence relationship between the three factors. The expected cell counts are the same as the observed cell frequencies.

$$\hat{n}_{ijk} = n_{ijk}$$

Graphical representation for the saturated model is given in the figure(6).

Example 25 Let us consider partial table which is based on clinical trial data [32].




Figure 6: The Saturated Model

Table 19: Results of Clinical Trial for the Effectiveness of an Analgesic Drug

<i>Status</i>	<i>Treatment</i>	<i>Response</i>		
		<i>Poor</i>	<i>Moderate</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
<i>1</i>	<i>Active</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>5</i>
	<i>placebo</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>2</i>	<i>Active</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>12</i>
	<i>placebo</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>5</i>

None of the model fits the data, we leave it for the reader to verify.

7 Model selection for the Decomposable Models

In this section, we discuss model selection for the decomposable models only, since a non-decomposable graphical model can be reduced to the decomposable one by adding minimal number of edges to the graph. For the details on minimum triangulation we refer to [46] and an excellent survey article by [30].

Though decomposable models are a restricted family of GLLMs, selecting an optimal model from the class of decomposable graphical models is known to be an intractable problem. Most of all existing model selection algorithms are based on forward selection, backward elimination or combination of the both. There is a vast literature available for model selection and inference on graphical models, i.e., see [47], [10], [25], [45] and [2].

We now illustrate the backward model selection procedure for a real data called “women and mathematics(WAM)”, data used in [22]. We use Wermuth’s backward elimination algorithm, see [48] for the details. The data is shown in the table(20).

Table 20: The table WAM

School		Suburban School				Urban School			
Sex		Female		Male		Female		Male	
Plan	Preference	Attend	Not Attend	Attend	Not Attend	Attend	Not Attend	Attend	Not Attend
College	Maths-sciences								
	Agree	37	27	51	48	51	55	109	86
	Disagree	16	11	10	19	24	28	21	25
	Liberal arts								
	Agree	16	15	7	6	32	34	30	31
	Disagree	12	24	13	7	55	39	26	19
Job	Maths-sciences								
	Agree	10	8	12	15	2	1	9	5
	Disagree	9	4	8	9	8	9	4	5
	Liberal arts								
	Agree	7	10	7	3	5	2	1	3
	Disagree	8	4	6	4	10	9	3	6

Let us recall that graphical models are completely specified by their two-factor interactions. By the hierarchical principle, if a two-factor term is set to zero then any higher order term that contain that particular two-factor term will be also set to zero.

The Wermuth's procedure starts with the saturated model, a single clique that includes all the two-factor effects as given in the figure (7). The vertices "a", "b", "c", "d", "e", "f" correspond to the factors "Attendance", "Sex", "School", "Agree", "Subject" and "Plans" respectively.




Figure 7: The Saturated Model for WAM

In the next step, all two-factor interactions $\binom{6}{2}$ are considered for elimination. We fix a backward elimination cut off level $\alpha = 0.5$. Among the two-factor interactions the term having the largest p-value are considered for elimination, only if the p-value exceeds α . From the table (21), we

choose the edge (b,f) for deletion the resulting graphical model is the cliques [abcde][acdef]

Table 21: WAM: [abcde]

Edge	Clique	d.f.	G^2	p-value
ab	[acdef][bcdef]	16	18.585	0.29078
ac	[abdef][bcdef]	16	20.689	0.19080
ad	[abcef][bcdef]	16	14.172	0.58588
ae	[abcdf][bcdef]	16	18.781	0.28017
af	[abcde][bcdef]	16	11.951	0.74734
bc	[acdef][abdef]	16	26.739	0.04447
bd	[acdef][abcef]	16	34.733	0.00432
be	[acdef][abcdf]	16	56.570	0.00000
bf	[acdef][abcde]	16	11.673	0.76616
cd	[abcef][abdef]	16	29.439	0.02114
ce	[abcdf][abdef]	16	26.052	0.05329
cf	[abcde][abdef]	16	81.657	0.00000
de	[abcdf][abcef]	16	78.248	0.00000
df	[abcef][abcde]	16	46.221	0.00009
ef	[abcde][abcde]	16	17.728	0.34005

In the next step, we consider the cliques [abcde] and [acdef] . The edges ac, ad, ae, cd, ce and de are common to both the cliques, hence they are not considered for elimination. The candidate edges for deletion are ab, bc, bd, be, af, cf, df, ef. Let us examine the p-values for these edges as in the table(22).

Table 22: WAM: [abcde][acdef]

Edge	Clique	d.f.	G^2	p-value
ab	[bcde][acdef]	8	12.456	0.13198
bc	[acde][acdef]	8	18.097	0.02051
bd	[acde][acdef]	8	27.358	0.00061
be	[acde][acdef]	8	49.723	0.00000
af	[abcde][cdef]	8	5.822	0.66711
cf	[abcde][adef]	8	73.014	0.00000
df	[abcde][acef]	8	38.845	0.00001
ef	[abcde][acdf]	8	10.881	0.20852

We delete the edges (af), the resulting graphical model is [abcde] [cdef]. Similarly we proceed further and in the next step the edge (ad) gets deleted and the resulting graphical model is [abce] [bcde] [cdef] as given in the figure(8).




Figure 8: The Fitted Model for WAM

In the next step candidate edges for deletion are $[ab], [ac], [ae], [bd], [cf]$. We notice that none of the p-value is greater than $\alpha = 0.05$ as given in the table (23). So we stop with the model $[abce][bcde][cdef]$.

Table 23: WAM: $[abce][bcde][cdef]$

Edge	Clique	d.f.	G^2	p-value
ab	$[ace][bce][bcde][cdef]$	4	10.606	0.03137
ac	$[bce][ace][bcde][cdef]$	4	10.432	0.03374
ae	$[bce][abc][bcde][cdef]$	4	10.426	0.03383
bd	$[abce][cde][bce][cdef]$	4	25.507	0.00004
cf	$[abce][bcde][def][cde]$	4	67.832	0.00000

8 Computational details

All the experimental results in this paper were carried out using R 3.1.3 . For fitting LLMs, there are several function in R, for example `glm( )` and `loglin( )` in the “stats” library and `loglm( )` in the ”MASS” library. For model selection, we used `dmod()` and `backward()` functions implemented in the package “gRim”. All the packages used are available at <http://CRAN.R-project.org/>.

9 Concluding Remarks

In summary, we have discussed fundamental mathematical and statistical theory of GLLM and its applications. We restricted our attention to the complete table to make our discussion simple, as the tables having zero entries require special treatment. See chapter 8 of [9] for the analysis of contingency tables with zero cell counts. The limitations, and open problems in the use of GLLM for recursive relationships can be further explored, see section 5.4 of [9].

References

- [1] A. Agresti. *Categorical Data Analysis*. 2nd edition. Wiley-Interscience, New York, 2002.
- [2] Genevera I. Allen and Zhandong Liu. “A Log-Linear Graphical Model for Inferring Genetic Networks from High-Throughput Sequencing Data”. In: *BIBM* (2012), pp. 1–6.
- [3] A. H. Andersen. “Multidimensional contingency tables”. In: *Scand. J. Statist.* 3 (1974), pp. 115–127.
- [4] E. B. Andersen. “Sufficiency and Exponential Families for Discrete Sample Spaces”. In: *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 65.331 (1970), pp. 1248–1255.
- [5] M. S. Bartlett. “Contingency table interactions”. In: *Supplement to the Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*. 2 (1935), pp. 248–252.
- [6] M.W. Birch. “Maximum likelihood in three-way contingency tables”. In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* 25 (1963), pp. 220–233.
- [7] Y.M.M. Bishop. “Full contingency tables, logits, and split contingency tables”. In: *Biometrics* 25 (1969), pp. 383–400.
- [8] Y.M.M. Bishop, S.E. Fienberg, and P.W. Holland. *Discrete Multivariate Analysis: Theory and Practice*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1989 edition.
- [9] R. Christensen. *Log-Linear Models and Logistic Regression*. 2nd edition. Springer, 1997.
- [10] Corinne Dahinden, Markus Kalisch, and Peter Buhlmann. “Decomposition and Model Selection for Large Contingency Tables”. In: *Biometrical Journal* 52 (2010), 233–252.
- [11] J. N. Darroch. “Interactions in multi-factor contingency tables”. In: *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B* 24 (1962), pp. 251–263.
- [12] J. N. Darroch et al. “Markov fields and log-linear interaction models for contingency tables”. In: *Ann. Statist.* 8 (1980), pp. 522–539.
- [13] J. N. Darrocha et al. “Markov fields and log-linear interaction models for contingency tables”. In: *Ann. Statist.* 8 (1980), pp. 522–539.
- [14] L. J. Davis. “Exact tests for 2 by 2 contingency tables”. In: *Amer. Statist.* 40 (1968), pp. 139–141.
- [15] A. P. Dawid. “Conditional Independence in Statistical Theory”. In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* 41.1 (1979), pp. 1–31.
- [16] W. E. Deming and F. F. Stephan. “On a Least Squares Adjustment of a Sampled Frequency Table When the Expected Marginal Totals are Known”. In: *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 11.4 (1940), pp. 427–444.

- [17] D. Edwards. *Introduction to Graphical Modeling*. 2nd edition. NY: SpringerVerlag, 2000.
- [18] S.E. Fienberg. *The Analysis of Cross-classified Categorical Data*. 2nd Edition. The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1980.
- [19] Stephen E. Fienberg. “An Iterative Procedure for Estimation in Contingency Tables”. In: *Ann. Math. Statist.* 41.3 (1970), pp. 901–917.
- [20] Stephen E. Fienberg and Alessandro Rinaldo. “Three Centuries of Categorical Data Analysis: Log-linear Models and Maximum Likelihood Estimation”. In: *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* 137(11) (2007), pp. 3430–3445.
- [21] R.A. Fisher. “On the mathematical foundations of theoretical statistics”. In: *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London* Part A.222 (1922), pp. 309–368.
- [22] E. B. Fowlkes, A. E. Freeny, and J. M. Landwehr. “Evaluating logistic models for large contingency tables”. In: *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc* 83 (1988), pp. 611–622.
- [23] G. F. V. Glonek, J. N. Darroch, and T. P. Speed. “On the Existence of Maximum Likelihood Estimators for Hierarchical Loglinear Models”. In: *Scand. J. Statist.* 15 (1988), pp. 187–193.
- [24] L. A. Goodman. “How to ransack social mobility tables and other kinds of cross-classification tables”. In: *Amer. J. Sociol.* 75 (1969), pp. 1–40.
- [25] L. A. Goodman. “The analysis of multidimensional contingency tables: Stepwise procedures and direct estimation methods for building models for multiple classifications”. In: *Technometrics* 13 (1971a), pp. 31–66.
- [26] L. A. Goodman. “The multivariate analysis of qualitative data: Interaction among multiple classifications”. In: *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc* 65 (1970), pp. 226–256.
- [27] L. A. Goodman. “The partitioning of chi-square, the analysis of marginal contingency tables, and the estimation of expected frequencies in multidimensional contingency tables”. In: *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* 66 (1971b), pp. 339–344.
- [28] S. J. Haberman. “Log-linear models for frequency data: Sufficient statistics and likelihood equations”. In: *Annals of Statistics* 1.4 (1973), pp. 617–632.
- [29] S. J. Haberman. “The Analysis of Frequency Data”. In: *University of Chicago Press* (1974).
- [30] Pinar Heggernes. “Minimal triangulations of graphs: A survey”. In: *Discrete Mathematics* 306.3 (2006), pp. 297–317.

- [31] D. Knoke and P.J Burke. “Log-linear Models”. In: *Sage, Beverly Hills, CA* (1980).
- [32] G.G. Koch et al. “Overview of categorical analysis methods”. In: *SAS-SUGI* 8 (1983), pp. 785–795.
- [33] S. Kreiner. “Analysis of multidimensional contingency tables by exact conditional tests: Techniques and strategies”. In: *Scand. J. Statist.* 14 (1987), pp. 97–112.
- [34] S. Kreiner. “Interaction models”. In: *Encyclopedia of Biostatistics Chichester, UK: Wiley* (1998).
- [35] J. R. Landis et al. “Average partial association in three-way contingency tables: A review and discussion of alternative tests”. In: *Internat. Statist.* 46 (1978), pp. 237–254.
- [36] J. B Lang. “Maximum likelihood methods for a generalized class of log-linear models”. In: *Ann. Statist* 24 (1996), pp. 726–752.
- [37] J. B Lang. “On the comparison of multinomial and Poisson log-linear models”. In: *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B* 58 (1996), pp. 253–266.
- [38] J. B. Lang, J. W. McDonald, and P. W. F. Smith. “Association-marginal modeling of multivariate categorical responses: A maximum likelihood approach”. In: *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* 94 (1999), pp. 1161–1171.
- [39] S. L Lauritzen. *Graphical Models*. 2nd edition. Oxford University Press Inc., New York, 1996.
- [40] S. L. Lauritzen, T. P. Speed, and K. Vijayan. “Decomposable graphs and hypergraphs”. In: *Journal of The Australian Mathematical Society* 36.01 (1984).
- [41] Glen Meeden et al. “The Admissibility Of The Maximum Likelihood Estimator For Decomposable Log-Linear Interaction Models For Contingency Tables”. In: *Commun. Statist. Ser. A* 27 (1998), pp. 473–493.
- [42] J. A. Nelder and R. W. M. Wedderburn. “Generalized linear models”. In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* 135 (1972), pp. 370–384.
- [43] J. Pearl and A. Paz. “Graphoids: A graph based logic for reasoning about relevance relations”. In: *Advances in Artificial Intelligence* 2 (1987), pp. 357–363.
- [44] Karl Pearson. “Mathematical contributions to the theory of evolution”. In: *Dulau and Co* (1904).
- [45] P. Ravikumar, M. J. Wainwright, and J. Lafferty. “High-dimensional Ising model selection using L1-regularized logistic regression”. In: *Annals of Statistics* 38.3 (2010), pp. 1287–1319.

- [46] D. Rose et al. “Algorithmic aspects of vertex elimination on graphs”. In: *SIAM J. Comput.* 5 (1976), pp. 146–160.
- [47] Martin J. Wainwright and Michael I. Jordan. *Graphical Models, Exponential Families, and Variational Inference*. Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning, 2008.
- [48] Nanny Wermuth. “Model search among multiplicative models”. In: *Biometrics* 32 (1976), pp. 253–263.
- [49] Douglas B. West. *Introduction to Graph Theory*. 2nd Edition. The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2000.
- [50] J. Whittaker. *Graphical Models in Applied Multivariate Statistics*. 2nd edition. Chichester: Wiley, 1990.
- [51] Daniel Zelterman. *Models for Discreet Data*. 2nd edition. Oxford University Press Inc., New York, 2006.

This figure "finalmodel.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1603.04122v1>

This figure "saturated.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1603.04122v1>

This figure "step1.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1603.04122v1>